

New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations.

SATURDAY, JULY 28, 1917

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York Corporation. Office: 150 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone: 150 Nassau Street, New York. Telegrams: Tribune, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00
Daily and Sunday, 3 mos. \$2.50
Daily and Sunday, 6 mos. \$4.50
Daily and Sunday, 1 year \$8.00
Sunday only, 1 year \$4.00

FOREIGN RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.50
Daily and Sunday, 3 mos. \$3.50
Daily and Sunday, 6 mos. \$6.50
Daily and Sunday, 1 year \$11.00
Sunday only, 1 year \$5.50

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—no risk of dissatisfaction results in any case. THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

A Time for Courage

In discussing his first battle, in his Memoirs, General Grant recalled the fact that while his own men were in disorder he caught a glimpse of the enemy retreating quite as rapidly as his own men and giving evidence of being at least as scared. This was, as he says, a lesson which he never forgot during all the four years that followed.

It begins to look as if some sort of evidence like this was necessary for the American people, who are going through periods of depression and optimism with great rapidity and with too little regard for the essential facts in the war. If anybody had told us in any day of August, 1914, that the Germans would never again during the war be as near Paris as they were in the last week of August, the world would have accepted this as evidence of a certain German defeat. Two years ago, when the Germans were pursuing the broken Russian armies into the heart of the Muscovite Empire, at a time when the British armies were not yet organized, there was cause for depression and for pessimism.

The present prospect in the war is grave enough, but the extent of the gravity is summed up in the fact that there is no present prospect of a victorious peace in the immediate future, and that those who know most about the situation recognize that there are hard suffering and bitter fighting ahead before the end.

But does anybody imagine that, bitter as is the prospect for all on this side of the firing line, it is more promising to the Germans? Two years ago we were talking about the possible return of the Germans from the East to the West. Two years ago we were talking about the prospect of an absolute German victory, just as a little less than three years ago we were contemplating what seemed the immediate prospect of the conquest of France.

The question before us now is not a question of whether Germany can dominate the world as the immediate consequence of the present war. The German advance in the West has been stopped for all time. Whether it be possible, without American aid, to push the Germans back to the French frontier may be problematical. Whether it may be next summer or the summer after before a military decision can be had in favor of the Allies is open to discussion. But no one will now discuss the chance of a decision in favor of the Germans on the West front, where the war must ultimately be won and lost.

In so far as the present events have served to demonstrate to the American people how serious is the task before us and how great the extent of the sacrifice they must make, they have served a useful end. If there has been any disposition to minimize the job, to underestimate the amount of American contribution that must be made, then we should be grateful for the adversities of the present hour.

But depression should not go beyond this; and there should be no failure to recognize how much has been won already, how far we have already marched on the road toward the liberation of all mankind from the German menace. We shall celebrate the third anniversary of the Marne in a few weeks. A year and a half after the German assault upon Verdun the French flag still waves over all the forts. Every battle on the Western front in recent months has resulted in the capture of great numbers of German prisoners and German guns, and in the present campaign we have seen more than one thousand square miles of French territory redeemed, while each successive thrust of the new British army has been more immediately and completely successful than that which preceded it.

We shall do ill to take counsel now of our fears or our apprehensions, at a time when there is less reason for fearing absolute German success than ever before in the war. We shall serve only the German ends if now we permit ourselves to be captured by German interpretations of existing conditions or by the anxious and too apprehensive words of those who have as yet had little experience in dealing with the world war.

The Russian collapse impresses us the more because we had a few weeks ago a little Russian offensive, momentarily successful, which suddenly transformed all our fears into hopes more unreasonable than our fears had been. Six months ago it had been recognized in Paris, London and Rome that Russia was to all practical purposes out of the war. Before the Romanoff dynasty fell it was known of all men that it was seeking to make a separate peace with Germany.

Russia has now struck and collapsed. What had been feared has become in great degree an actuality; but what would have been the situation in the world if Russia had collapsed two years ago, when there was no British army? Let us not be too ready to accept the arrival on the Western front of the troops now occupied with the Russian retreat. They may come in time, and they may not. But when they do come they will not give the Germans the advantage of numbers on the Western front to-day possessed by the Allies, and tomorrow we may hope that some thousands and hundreds of thousands of American troops will also be on the Western front.

Let no man imagine that Germany has gone through three years of this bitter, grueling struggle without suffering as intensely as any participant in it. The pick of her manhood has gone. Isolated from the world, suffering hardships which are only just beginning to be felt in France and England, for more than two years conscious that whatever the issue of the war the German commercial and industrial future is doomed, it is not with enthusiasm and it is not with an overplus of hope that the German people are now looking forward to another winter of war and another summer of carnage.

There is a balance somewhere between that alert appreciation of the difficulties of a situation which is necessary to the performance of a duty and that blind, unreasoning fear which magnifies each defeat, minimizes each victory and plays the enemy's game by making him out not only stronger than he is, but also stronger than he possibly could be.

To believe that Germany can win this war would be to believe that all our faith is empty; that all we have loved and believed and trusted in the years of our lifetime and all that has been believed and trusted by our fathers and grandfathers is now going into the melting pot; that barbarism is at last to prevail over civilization, and brute force to replace humanity and justice. To believe that Germany can win this war is to cease to believe in all that life holds for any of us.

And there is nothing in the present outlook or the past history of this war to warrant such a belief. In August and September, 1914, the German army, prepared for forty years, superior in numbers, in all that mechanical devices can do for an army, was defeated along the Marne, and that defeat made inevitable the ultimate defeat of Germany. The drive to Paris failed; the drive to Calais failed; the drive to Verdun failed. Along the Chemin-des-Dames still another German drive is failing, and before many weeks have passed we shall see another British victory greater than the Somme, or Arras, or Ypres.

General Foch, who won the Battle of the Marne, wrote years before that a battle is only lost when people believe it to be lost. On the battlefield he sent to Joffre a message we may well remember now: "My left is shaken, my centre is retreating, my right is routed; I shall attack." He did attack and won the Marne. We shall not lose this war with the Germans unless we will to lose it, unless we consent to lose it, unless we permit ourselves to be conquered in spirit while we still have weapons in our hands and strength in our bodies. It is time for the people of the United States to seek to acquire something of the spirit and something of the determination of the French soldiers who said at Verdun, "They shall not pass!"

The Horse Car's Passing

One wonders whether the obsequies of the last stage coach on the Boston Post Road resembled those of the city's last horse car. And shall we sigh some day for the picturesque past of the jingling horse-drawn tram as we do now for that of the gallant coach; or shall we always treat things Victorian with scant regard despite their antiquity—the mansard roof, the brownstone front, bonnets, bustles and horse cars?

There was a painful note of the derisive in certain features of Thursday's ceremonial which seemed to mock at the white hairs of the ancient driver, the dejected gait of his knee-sprung team and the droop of the vehicle. The roaring fire in the rusty stove on such a day suggested a sad disrespect toward age, already graining under a load of sleek traction trucks and Public Service commissioners—upstarts, all of them, with no reverence for the historical.

Where were they fifty-three years ago, when the first car of the Bleeker Street and Fulton Ferry line rolled between banks of cheering citizens, its horses doing

the goosetep, while their harness bells heralded a new era? The nation was at war then, too, and long accustomed to casualty lists. Pacifists were called Copperheads and the devilish Monitor ruled the wave. A faithful vehicle which has spanned the years between that day of hoopskirts and canister and this of kilt and poison gas should have had a funeral befitting its longevity, conducted tenderly by contemporaries. The G. A. R. boys should have scraped up a guard of honor as an escort on this last trip of an old comrade, and sounded taps when Tom Mortimer, driver for forty years, unhitched his veteran pair at the end of the run.

But it's all over now, though the funeral baked meats have been masticated with an unseemly relish, and those of us who mourn for the community the passing of this distinctive relic of an heroic age must take heart for the straphangers of to-day. We have one consolation—the old ruin was operated at a loss for years before being chloroformed.

Mr. Mann's Latest Break

If the Republicans of the House of Representatives have any sense of the fitness of things they will at once dispense with Mr. Mann's services as their leader. He is a leader without any talents for leadership. He progresses from one fiasco to another. His capacity for sensing the wrong trail and following it is inexhaustible and incurable.

Mr. Mann has no vision. He cannot interpret public sentiment. He lays his course solely according to his own prepossessions and prejudices. A few days ago he announced that he was going to force a separate vote in the House on the Senate amendment to the food control bill creating a Joint Committee of Congress on Expenditures in Connection with the Conduct of the War. President Wilson had just written a letter to Chairman Lever of the House Committee on Agriculture strongly objecting to the creation of such a committee. Mr. Mann's move, made without sufficient consultation with his colleagues, had the effect of committing the Republican party in the House to a piece of legislation which the President had publicly opposed on the ground that its passage would be equivalent to a vote of lack of confidence in him.

This procedure was the reverse of judicious. The Republicans in Congress have nothing to gain by exhibiting a spirit of captious opposition to the President. They are in a minority in each branch. If Congress feels that it ought to keep in close touch with the uses made of the money which it votes for war purposes, if it feels that it ought to defend its prerogative to inquire fully into all Executive expenditures—that is a matter in which the members of both parties are equally interested. The action taken should be non-partisan. It is not the minority's business to take the lead in asserting against the Executive privileges which are not just as highly valued by the majority.

We are not much impressed by President Wilson's assertion that the proposed Joint Committee on Expenditures would necessarily hamper the prosecution of the war. Nor can we find any sound authority for the statement that the Committee on the Conduct of the War created during President Lincoln's first administration was "a cause of constant and distressing harassment" to him and retarded his task "all but impossible."

The Civil War committee did try to meddle in a small way with the military conduct of the war. But in that era every civil functionary considered himself competent to direct strategy. It is impossible to shift the failure of Northern military policy up to 1864 to the shoulders of any Congressional committee. Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Stanton and their figurehead military adviser, Major General Halleck, were the chief authors of that failure. They botched the military conduct of the war completely. No outside civilian body ever had a real chance to make matters worse. It was not until Lincoln, seeing the truth at last, brought Grant to the East and wrote to him, "The particulars of your plans I neither know nor seek to know," that the North's military policy became rational and fruitful.

If Congress wants to appoint a committee to examine into war expenditure, it is entirely within its right in doing so. But such a committee, to be effective, must represent a united Congress. The Democratic majority must want it as well as the Republican minority. Mr. Mann could not understand this, and his Republican associates have been obliged to overrule his programme of making a party fight on the issue.

The gentleman from Illinois was impulsively mistaken, as usual. How long will the Republican party in the House put up with such leadership?

A "Leave-to-Print" Watchdog

It is of interest beyond his district that Representative Walsh, of New Bedford, has attracted attention in the national House of Representatives by his efforts to prevent the waste of material and labor involved by successful attempts to pad "The Congressional Record" with extraneous matters. It is good to read in "The Congressional Record" how the objection of this Massachusetts Congressman has checked effort after effort to secure the publication of all sorts of things calculated to pad speeches through the use of matter never brought before the House.

The path by which the member from our 14th District has secured national attention and commendation has always been open to any one with the courage to take it. When Mr. Walsh, watchdog of "The Congressional Record," is absent from his seat the wasters of Uncle Sam's type, ink and paper make the best of their opportunity. In order to make a thorough job of his crusade he should leave somebody on guard when absent, if any member there be willing to risk the unpopularity among his associates which Objector Walsh has invited. It is encouraging to know that, for the present at least, "leave to print" does not come so easy as formerly in the lower branch of Congress.

Politics and Food

Senate Would Pay Wheat Farmer for Voting Right

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Are all of the newspapers in the country now afraid to criticize the Senate food bill? We are flooded day by day with cries to cut down the high cost of living, to save, to conserve, to grow crops and so on, and, as a result, the Senate then passes a bill raising the cost of flour to \$13.50 a barrel at the minimum, and the farmers may get as much over \$2 a bushel for their wheat as they want to charge, and the government is to aid them.

Inasmuch as the government fathered this bill and has repeatedly urged its passage, one can only come to the conclusion that this clause of the bill is a repayment to the Western farmers for the vote cast last election, and the same is made a direct charge upon the Eastern part of the country, which voted directly opposite. Certainly politics is at the bottom of such legislation, and exceptionally dirty politics at that.

The Administration tried twenty-nine different measures in order to establish a gag law by which its conduct of the war should not be criticized, and this morning we are greeted with a proposition that the House and Senate must not appoint a committee to oversee the conduct of the war, but the same must be left entirely in the hands of the one man who under the law as it stands may not be criticized by any one. This is the thirtieth attempt at a gag law, and, as every newspaper and every one else in the country seems frightened to death over any criticism of anything the Administration wants, we are evidently finally to be blessed with just what the Administration wants, a gag law which will obliterate every right of free speech in the country.

Our sons may sicken and die in unsanitary camps south of Mexico and Dixon's line, as they did in the Spanish War; they may be fed with embezzled beef or starved at the option of the government, and if we criticize, away with us to a dungeon—we are unpatriotic, we are traitors, and only the admittedly inefficient, incompetent officials of the government are to be protected, while starvation, insufficiency of food and equipment and graft are to be upheld. Outside the farmer, the business interests of the country will be at the mercy of any claim a Daniels or a Baker may make, and any criticism will be treachery.

Is it not time the business interests of this land awoke to the drifting of conditions at Washington? Are we to sit down and supinely allow our liberty and free speech to be taken from us?

The people must look to their usual channels of expression, the newspapers, and if they, too, are tainted with that wonderful dread and the same dirty politics, then the country is gone, indeed, and it would be better for all to follow the government mouthpiece, James Hamilton Lewis, in his despairing cry for peace at yesterday's session.

Otherwise our sons will be murdered through incompetence, inefficiency and graft, and our billions frittered away to deserving Democrats, while we, a great country, are borrowing rifles from England and cannon from France, and at the same time are robbing our allies in the price of wheat to feed the Russian army who voted the right way. It is a fine outlook. J. Q. W. Brooklyn, July 24, 1917.

"Fish in the Sea"

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Six months ago I applied at the coastwise department of a local store for tinned grayfish. The head of the department had not heard of it, but on my showing numerous newspaper articles and bulletins from the National Bureau of Fisheries agreed to stock it. A few weeks later I received a letter of regret, stating that the demand for grayfish, especially in the West, complicated by the scarcity of tin due to the war, made it impossible to secure sufficient to risk advertising as being carried in stock.

Under date of July 17 I was advised that they could now supply it in tall salmon cans at 15 cents each. The first tin of what I ordered was served to me. Now, whenever I go fishing, I bring home the once despised fish and find it easily prepared, agreeable to the senses and palatable.

The United Anglers' League has done good work in helping to rehabilitate this innocent victim of stupid prejudice. For centuries his flesh has been esteemed abroad, especially in Great Britain and along the Mediterranean, but nature has been so prodigal in the New World that we have picked and chosen and have suffered thousands of tons of edible food to rot on the land, at sea and in the water. The economic changes of the last few years and the necessity for the conservation of food make it incumbent on all right minded people to discard unreasoning prejudice and to support the authorities in converting into a valuable asset a hitherto waste product. The live fish is abundant in our waters throughout the summer, and fresh is even superior to the canned article. Let the anglers bring home the grayfish, instead of knocking him on the head, and we will be surprised to find how excellent his flavor. He should be boiled, the best to remove the tough skin. F. I. SHERMAN. New York, July 21, 1917.

A Protest

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: May we beg permission to offer a protest against the cartoons against the paper calling itself "Issues and Events" and published on Park Row, New York City? This periodical is very thinly disguised German propaganda of the most pernicious type, the more dangerous as it parades as being strongly patriotic. There seems reason to believe that some effort is made to circulate it in the more outlying districts.

We desire to point out the fact that in regions where the population contains a rather high percentage of uneducated and uninformed people who are very open to the least suggestion, and who believe implicitly all that they see in print, the circulation of such an organ is highly dangerous and inflammatory. Is there no law which could be put in operation which will permit the suppression of periodicals which under the circumstances can only be considered as treasonable? It would seem that this is no time to wait upon half measures.

AMELIE TROUBETSKOY,
(The Princess Marie Troubetzkoy)
EDWARD HALE BIERSTADT,
Castle Hill, Cobham, Albemarle County, Va., July 24, 1917.

Conscript the Loafer

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The country has called on the eligible men to fight and is mobilizing industry. The next step is to mobilize the idle and slothful, all those who are either not working at all or are frittering time away at dispensable semi-employment. Here is the cure for the I. W. W. desire to breed loafers and the hookworm of youth. There should be a selective draft for work, applying to all ages between 17 and 47.

Send an army of men in October to Florida, South Carolina, Southern Texas, to grow beans, potatoes and other staple foods and let us bring down the cost of living, and there is plenty of other real work ahead of us. The selective draft for work would probably cover a million and a half who will not volunteer for anything but the softest kind of ash. H. D. PARKER. Asheville, N. C., July 24, 1917.

The Conscientious Objector

By Bishop J. R. Cooke

Of the Methodist Episcopal Church South

(From The Methodist Advocate-Journal)

In my judgment some things should be stated frankly and without confusion of thought about so-called rights of conscience which operate only one way—that is, to the interest of the individual claiming them. If it is not ungenerous, nor is it without historical ground, to say that rights of conscience are too easily manufactured by sophisticated minds who are always conscientious enough to let others bear the burdens, the hardships and sufferings of life, while they enjoy its benefits.

In the first place, this whole question of the Conscientious Objector under present social and political conditions is not, it seems to me, a Church question at all; nor is it, except by a mixing of things that differ, in any way related to questions of religious freedom. It is a state question and belongs to the domain of government. It certainly is not wholly a question pure and simple whether I should obey "God or man," which in self-interest assumes the whole matter, to begin with. Certainly no man has the right to disobey God. Certainly no government has the right to compel a man to do a wrong thing.

But are all wars wrong? Wars of hate, wars of aggression, of expansion of wealth and plunder are wrong. But wars of defence, wars punishing evildoers, are not wrong. The police powers—that is, the moral forces of the universe—are not wrong. The right to live is not immoral. It is not wrong to prevent a murderer from killing my wife and children, or to prevent a dehumanized fiend from setting fire to a city. But if the Conscientious Objector insists that the question is solely one of obedience to God, then the question arises, Shall he obey God in this one particular only—that is, of not going to war—and he be the sole judge of what is righteous war, or shall he also obey God down the whole line? Shall he obey God the whole way or only a part of the way? Shall a man obey God by refusing to tell a falsehood at one end of a line and be a beneficiary of the falsehood at the other end?

No Moral Standard

Upon what moral principle grounded in the constitution of things, then, does the Conscientious Objector take his stand? Universal reason will demand that the Conscientious Objector shall base his moral contention upon universal moral principles. He is not a moral standard for the race. He cannot, therefore, establish his opinions upon individualistic notions of right and wrong, which notions would also shelter headhunters, Mormon polygamists and many moral and political infamies like the German war code or the Zimmermann note to Mexico, but upon principles valid for all time for all men under all conditions and in all places.

Does he take his stand, then, upon an assumed law of God which is nowhere expressed? Very well, then, upon what moral law of God, expressed or unexpressed, does he assume the further right to appropriate to himself, to exercise and enjoy for himself, the results of war, which are brought by the sufferings and blood of others who lay down their lives for the sake of others who are not fighting? No man has the right to be a thief. Here is a terrible law. Into this is a thief, years in preparation, we are forced by a military caste, its frightfulness, its defiance of all law, human and divine; the murder of our people, women and children; the wanton destruction of our property, aggression upon our rights upon the seas, the contempt of our government at home and abroad and plotting against our peace, to say nothing of its avowed purpose of world dominion and subjection of all nations to its brutal might, all of which is buttressed by a perverted morality which crushes every principle of the Gospel of God in order to justify the progressive diabolism of its ruthless force.

Self-Defence a Necessity

To defend our own government, our own people, our own homes and Christian civilization, which, while very imperfect as it is, is nevertheless the fairest flower that ever yet blossomed on the soil of humanity, we are forced to send our sons and brothers to the battlefield and to death. For these rights and blessings, the product of God's presence in human history and all that they include, these beloved ones endure untold hardships, sufferings, bloody wounds, loss of eyes and limbs and death itself in the trenches. They die that our institutions might live.

But the Conscientious Objector will not die. He will not die for any of these principles, nor will he suffer one hour of agony, nor endure a pin prick. He is opposed to war—to any war, even though the defence of all that God, in the development of human-

ity, has slowly evolved in history and made the heirlooms of the nation. But he is perfectly willing to enjoy all the benefits, social, political, cultural, commercial or other, that these men have won or preserved for him at the cost of their own blood and suffering and death. For if all war is wrong, upon what moral principle does the Conscientious Objector wipe the bloody spot of guilt from his own hands by simply objecting to war while he enjoys the benefits of war? Is the receiver of stolen goods less criminal than the thief? Is not the beneficiary of a crime a partner in the crime? Is such a man a Conscientious Objector at all? I insist that the Conscientious Objector's conscience shall go down the whole line and not stop just where he pleases.

No Support in Human Law

But again, does this Objector take his stand upon any human law? If he does, the same questions confront him. For instance, does he assume the right to refuse support to government, to society, to civilization, and yet demand protection of government? To demand the right to make government? To participate in a social and cultural life which will not defend? Does he assume the right to the benefits of a civilization which he tamely surrenders to the ruthless hoofs of barbarism? By what human right will he do this?

Nothing, it seems to me, fits the Conscientious Objector so well as a parody on Goldsmith's poem, "The Hermit":
No flocks that roam the valley free
To slaughter I condemn;
The butchers kill the meat for me;
I buy the meat of them.

He will not go to war, but is willing to enjoy the results of war. He will obey God at one end of the line, but ignore him at the other. It seems to me that one should either do the killing or stop the eating, or both. There is no substitute in morals.

But is it possible in any way conceivable for the Conscientious Objector to disentangle himself from his moral twittings if he remains a citizen of a government which demands his support for value received? Upon what moral principle everywhere valid is this assumed right based? It is very evident that the Conscientious Objector cannot play fast and loose with the laws of God and man at the same time, and plead conscientious scruples when it is his pleasure and interest to do so. Conscientious objectors to war like the Quakers do not do so. They do not play ball with conscience that way. They do their part where the government desires that part shall be done. But our American variety of objectors, of English, of all, will not do anything but blandly receive the benefits of others' hardship, sufferings and death.

A Purely Governmental Question

The question, I repeat, is not a Church question. It is a purely governmental question. What then should the government do? Should such persons be punished, put in prison or interned? No! Government has no right to punish a man for his opinion. It seems to me, therefore, that the simplest way to deal with this difficulty, various and complicated as the questions are, is: Let the government respect the Conscientious Objector's opinions, thus giving him all benefits of doubt, but at the same time let the government severely insist that he shall take the full consequences of his opinions. If he is sincere, he cannot object to that. Let him be deprived forever of all benefits of war, of all political and social and civil rights. "If any man will not work, neither shall he eat." He has no inherent right to these political and civil privileges. He was not born with them. He does not inherit them. He does not obtain them because he is a human being, but on the ground that he is a citizen of the United States. They are political grants. The power that gives has the power and right to take away. Let the objector then hold to his opinions, but let him also abide by the consequences of his opinions. The hair must go with the hide.

No honest Conscientious Objector, whether he is an atheist or not, can object to that. It is equal handed justice. If he is a moral person, his conscience must compel him to be just and honest, intellectually honest, socially honest, and the moral sense of mankind affirms with the law of God that no man has a right to things which do not belong to him. He cannot get something for nothing. The Conscientious Objector has no claim upon a government he disavows, upon a country—its laws, its institutions, its life and civilization—he will not defend. He is a man without a country, and if he is not a cowardly absterger, he will be sufficiently moral to abide by the natural consequences of his convictions.

To Operate or Not?

A Question Raised by an Experience in This City

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The Tribune of this date carries information to the effect that a surgeon of Chicago has permitted another child to die because, in his opinion, it was doomed to be a mental defective. Is there no way of persuading physicians and surgeons that they have no right to assume themselves to be infallible? I have intimate knowledge of a case in New York in which the life of a young woman would have been forfeited to the pride of opinion of a surgeon bearing an illustrious name had he been permitted to follow the course which he insisted upon following.

This young woman fell ill last winter. For many weeks her case, the symptoms of which were obscure, baffled the consulting physicians. Finally, a drastic operation was advised as the only hope of saving her life. The patient was in a private ward of one of New York's hospitals and was in the sleep of the anesthetic when the surgeon-in-chief of the hospital interfered and practically forbade the work. He declared the case to be inoperable and declined to take a chance of the patient dying on the operating table. He said that recovery, in any event, was impossible, and that the best thing was to permit the young woman to pass on to death. When her mother urged that every chance be taken to save her daughter's life, this eminent surgeon waved her aside as of small importance.

Fortunately, it so happened that there was in New York at that time a Western surgeon whose fame in recent years has become world-wide. With great difficulty he was persuaded to come into consultation. He flatly overruled his New York brother surgeon. The result was that the patient had to be removed to another hospital, where, six weeks ago, the "impossible" operation was performed with complete success. The young woman, now thoroughly convalescent, must have died had the first surgeon been permitted to have his own way.

I urge that the man whose obstinacy operated nearly cost a human life be fitted to be surgeon-in-chief of the hospital in which he holds sway.
LEO L. REDDING.
New York, July 24, 1917.

Publicity the Remedy

Without It No Results Can Be Secured at Washington

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I note with pleasure that both Denman and Goethals have been removed. This has been caused by publicity. It became necessary for the President to act. Let the good work continue.

There is but one way to cure our present inefficient government (personal opinion), and that is publicity by the daily papers. Political affiliations should be forgotten. Both England and France have removed incompetents. In the case of England this has been done by publicity.

It is felt by the large majority of citizens, and I believe by our navy as well as by our army, that both Daniels and Baker are out of their element. They should be removed. If this is true, it is the duty of our daily papers to print such a request in a prominent place, same to be continued until results are secured.

We will have enough to put up with on account of the unfortunate position of our time-of-peace political Congressmen, Senators and their friends, without the additional burden of inefficient heads of departments.
New York, July 24, 1917.
C. W. H.

Speed Up War Measures

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Has not the time arrived when all Americans should demand that the disgraceful wrangling over petty details of our vital war measures should cease in Washington and all uphold our President's hands by forwarding the bills needed? Won't each reader of this do his share by writing or speaking to others to hasten the passage of war measures?

MRS. GEORGE H. CLARK,
MRS. W. E. RAWKINS,
MISS HELEN CLARK,
MISS M. E. CLARK.
Roxmoor, Ulster County, N. Y., July 24, 1917.

Picketing

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I see that the President has pardoned those suffragette picketers who were sent to jail. Does he believe in picketing? By allowing picketing and the White House week after week has set an example that will encourage picketing and picketers all through the country.
T. L. MURPHY.
Fall River, Mass., July 21, 1917.

Comforts for the Navy

Suggestions to Those Who Want to Aid in a Good Work

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Replying to many who seem to be doubtful whether or not knitted garments are wanted or really worn, we would like to submit the following letter:

Mr. Herbert L. Satterlee, Chairman of the Navy Committee, Navy League, 509 Park Avenue, New York.

Dear Mrs. Satterlee:
I wish to thank you and commend a highly efficient service you ladies are performing in looking after the comfort of the men of the navy. The material goods you are doing is highly appreciated by the navy, particularly in the matter of socks covering. A wool-made sweater is certainly a comforting companion; heavy socks, flannels and such like are no less desirable during the rigors of a stormy watch at sea in the winter time. I can tell you that from personal experience. It has been called my attention that certain people are of the opinion that the navy do not want these articles. I fail to find any case where they are not highly appreciated, and the men would ask for more than one of such articles of apparel.
JOHN GRADY,
Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy, Recruiting Inspector, Eastern Division, New York, July 17, 1917.

There are many rumors circulating that we would like to refute and explain. We are informed by a very authoritative source that many of the volunteers have come from small towns and villages from all parts of the United States, and merely the fact that they have on their backs some of these articles is just within the amount that the law demands. The knitted garments are not only wanted, but desperately needed, to help complete the outfits furnished by the Navy Department.

Gray mufflers vs. blue mufflers—We wish to announce that principally for the sake of uniformity the navy decided on gray. Blue mufflers will be accepted, but gray as preferred.

Helmet's vs. mufflers—Helmet's are preferred of those who are able to knit them. Knitted helmet's are, indeed, better. Flannel helmet's will not be received by the Navy Department.

Socks—We are told by officers who have returned from the trenches that the life of a machine-made sock is ten hours, and the life of a hand-made sock five days and sometimes longer. The